

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 and 18-25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-10, 12-15 and 18-25 are amended. Various amendments are for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance; (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and/or (3) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. More specifically, allowable features of dependent claim 17 (and intermediate claim 16) are incorporated into independent claim 15. The other claim amendments are merely for clarity and do not raise any new issues. Entry is thus proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Office Action's indication that claims 11-14 and 19-20 are allowed and that claims 6 and 17 contain allowable subject matter. By this amendment, features of allowable claim 17 (and intermediate claim 16) are incorporated into independent claim 15. Thus, independent claim 15 defines patentable subject matter.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-9 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by U.S. Patent 6,192,230 to Van Bokhorst et al (hereafter Van Bokhorst). The Office Action also rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Van Bokhorst in view of U.S. Patent 6,480,476 to Willars. Still further, the Office Action rejects claims 10, 15-16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Van Bokhorst in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0132603 to Lindskog et al. (hereafter

Lindskog. Finally, the Office Action rejects claims 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,574,266 to Haartsen in view of Van Bokhorst. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a communication sensitivity checking portion of the wireless communications device configured to check a sensitivity of at least one communications channel used to communicate with an external access point and to provide a sensitivity signal based on the checked sensitivity. Independent claim 1 also recites a power mode changing portion of the wireless communications device configured to receive the sensitivity signal from the communication sensitivity checking portion and to change a power mode of the wireless communications device between a working mode and at least one sleep mode based on the sensitivity signal received from the communication sensitivity checking portion.

The applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. More specifically, the Office Action cites Van Bokhorst's col. 1, line 65–col. 2, line 25 and col. 3, lines 62-66 as teaching the claimed communication sensitivity checking portion and cites col. 2, lines 21-25 and col. 3, lines 60-66 as teaching the claimed power mode changing portion. The Office Action (on page 3) states that Van Bokhorst's traffic indicator message corresponds to the claimed sensitivity signal. However, applicant respectfully submits that the cited features of Van Bokhorst are not provided within a wireless communications device. Rather, Van Bokhorst very clearly describes that an access point 16 provides synchronizing messages and traffic indicator information. However, independent claim 1 very clearly describes a portion of the

wireless communications device providing a sensitivity signal and a portion of the wireless communications device receiving the sensitivity signal. Therefore, the Office Action's comments on page 3, first full paragraph, do not correspond to the claimed features.

Van Bokhorst does not teach or suggest the claimed wireless communications device that includes both a communication sensitivity checking portion and a power mode changing portion. Van Bokhorst also does not suggest that a wireless communications device provides a sensitivity signal based on the checked sensitivity and changing a power mode of the wireless communications device based on the sensitivity signal. The other applied references do not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 1. Accordingly, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 21 recites a communication sensitivity checking portion of the wireless communications device configured to check a sensitivity of at least one communications channel used to communicate with an external access point and to provide a sensitivity signal based on the checked sensitivity. Independent claim 21 also recites a transmission power changing portion of the wireless communications device configured to receive the sensitivity signal from the communication sensitivity checking portion and to change a transmission power of the wireless communications device based on the received sensitivity signal.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 21. Thus, independent claim 21 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 24 recites setting up a communications channel of a wireless LAN network, and the wireless LAN module checking a communications sensitivity of the set channel. Independent claim 24 also recites changing a transmission power of the wireless LAN module based on the checked communications sensitivity.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 24. The Office Action never discusses the claimed checking a communications sensitivity of the set channel. Haartsen and Von Bokhorst, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these features. Thus, independent claim 24 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 11, 15, 19, 21 and 24 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-15 and 18-25 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the

Serial No. 10/620,620

Docket No. HI-0157

Reply to Office Action dated January 12, 2007

application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694
Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah:

Date: March 8, 2007

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610